

PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO 2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
Roswell, NM: Group 2

	CAPTAN	CLOUDCROFT	DEXTER	EUNICE	HAGERMAN	JAL	LOVING	TEXICO	
1 Cost Factor Values									1
2 •Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	51.9%	40.3%	76.7%	62.6%	80.8%	61.4%	68.4%	50.5%	2
3 •Percent English Learners	0.0%	1.9%	19.6%	13.9%	10.7%	27.4%	33.5%	2.8%	3
4 •Percent Special Education (Census-based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	4
5 •Percent Mobility	23.7%	17.4%	19.2%	17.6%	20.5%	16.6%	12.6%	21.6%	5
6 •Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	22.4%	22.5%	23.0%	24.5%	28.2%	19.4%	23.1%	24.0%	6
7 •Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	33.3%	41.1%	31.1%	28.5%	30.0%	33.4%	29.8%	31.1%	7
8 •Total District Enrollment	568.0	469.5	1,106.0	585.0	443.0	439.0	573.5	526.5	8
9									9
10 Individual Formula Adjustments									10
11 <u>Student Needs</u>									11
12 •Free/Reduced Lunch	1.170	1.135	1.238	1.200	1.249	1.197	1.268	1.166	12
13 •English Learners	1.000	1.002	1.017	1.012	1.010	1.023	1.027	1.003	13
14 •Special Education	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	14
15 •Mobility	1.041	1.031	1.034	1.031	1.036	1.030	1.023	1.038	15
16 <u>Grade Composition</u>									16
17 •Grades 6-8	0.997	0.998	0.999	1.003	1.011	0.990	0.999	1.001	17
18 •Grades 9-12	1.003	1.039	0.994	0.981	0.988	1.004	0.988	0.993	18
19 <u>Scale (Enrollment)</u>									19
20 •Scale	1.337	1.393	1.176	1.328	1.411	1.414	1.334	1.358	20
21									21
22 Combined Adjustments									22
23 •Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.573	1.515	1.681	1.618	1.687	1.628	1.721	1.567	23
24 •Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.001	1.037	0.993	0.984	1.000	0.994	0.987	0.995	24
25 •Scale	1.337	1.393	1.176	1.328	1.411	1.414	1.334	1.358	25
26 Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs x Grade Composition x Scale)	2.104	2.187	1.963	2.114	2.379	2.288	2.265	2.117	26
27									27
28 Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	28
29 x Overall Adjustment	2.104	2.187	1.963	2.114	2.379	2.288	2.265	2.117	29
30 Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,744	\$11,165	\$10,021	\$10,795	\$12,148	\$11,684	\$11,566	\$10,807	30
31									31
32 x ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000	1.021	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.011	1.023	1.071	32
33 Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,744	\$11,394	\$10,021	\$10,795	\$12,148	\$11,809	\$11,832	\$11,577	33
34									34
35 x Total District Enrollment	568.0	469.5	1,106.0	585.0	443.0	439.0	573.5	526.5	35
36 Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$6,102,309	\$5,349,625	\$11,083,049	\$6,314,935	\$5,381,493	\$5,183,957	\$6,785,528	\$6,095,030	36
37									37
38 Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$4,430,289	\$4,249,495	\$8,077,776	\$4,124,656	\$3,918,703	\$3,739,794	\$5,086,374	\$4,630,624	38
39 + Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	39
40 2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$4,430,289	\$4,249,495	\$8,077,776	\$4,124,656	\$3,918,703	\$3,739,794	\$5,086,374	\$4,630,624	40
41									41
42 Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost = Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost on line 36 - 2007-2008 Total on line 40	\$1,672,020	\$1,100,130	\$3,005,273	\$2,190,278	\$1,462,790	\$1,444,162	\$1,699,154	\$1,464,406	42
43									43
44 Percent Increase/Decrease	37.7%	25.9%	37.2%	53.1%	37.3%	38.6%	33.4%	31.6%	44

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08
1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

CAPITAN

User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	51.9%	0.0%	16.0%	23.7%	22.4%	33.3%	568

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.519	1.000	1.160	1.237	1.224	1.333	568	2.94.E+17
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.170	1.000	1.291	1.041	0.997	1.003	1.337	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.573							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					1.001			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.337	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)					2.104			
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$10,744			
ISQ Formula Adjustment					1.000			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$10,744			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$6,102,309			
Actual Program Cost					\$4,430,289			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$1,672,020			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$6,102,309			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					37.7%			

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

CLOUDCROFT

	User Input Cost Factors						
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	40.3%	1.9%	16.0%	17.4%	22.5%	41.1%	470

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.403	1.019	1.160	1.174	1.225	1.411	469.5	2.72.E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.135	1.002	1.291	1.031	0.998	1.039	1.393	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.515							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					1.037			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.393	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	2.187							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,165							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.021							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,394							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$5,349,625							
Actual Program Cost	\$4,249,495							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,100,130							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$5,349,625							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	25.9%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08
1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
DEXTER
User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	76.7%	19.6%	16.0%	19.2%	23.0%	31.1%	1106

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.767	1.196	1.160	1.192	1.230	1.311	1106	2.15E+21
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.238	1.017	1.291	1.034	0.999	0.994	1.176	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.681							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.993			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.176	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)					1.963			
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$10,021			
ISQ Formula Adjustment					1.000			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$10,021			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$11,083,049			
Actual Program Cost					\$8,077,776			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$3,005,273			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$11,083,049			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					37.2%			

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

EUNICE

User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	62.6%	13.9%	16.0%	17.6%	24.5%	28.5%	585

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.626	1.139	1.160	1.176	1.245	1.285	585	4.28.E+17
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.200	1.012	1.291	1.031	1.003	0.981	1.328	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.618							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.984			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.328	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.114							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,795							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,795							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$6,314,935							
Actual Program Cost	\$4,124,656							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$2,190,278							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$6,314,935							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	53.1%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

HAGERMAN

User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	80.8%	10.7%	16.0%	20.5%	28.2%	30.0%	443

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.808	1.107	1.160	1.205	1.282	1.300	443	1.34.E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.249	1.010	1.291	1.036	1.011	0.988	1.411	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.687							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					1.000			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.411	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.379							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$12,148							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$12,148							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$5,381,493							
Actual Program Cost	\$3,918,703							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,462,790							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$5,381,493							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	37.3%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08
1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

JAL

User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	61.4%	27.4%	16.0%	16.6%	19.4%	33.4%	439

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.614	1.274	1.160	1.166	1.194	1.334	439	1.20E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.197	1.023	1.291	1.030	0.990	1.004	1.414	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.628							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.994			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.414	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)					2.288			
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$11,684			
ISQ Formula Adjustment					1.011			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$11,809			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$5,183,957			
Actual Program Cost					\$3,739,794			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$1,444,162			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$5,183,957			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					38.6%			

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

LOVING

User Input Cost Factors

	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	88.4%	33.5%	16.0%	12.6%	23.1%	29.8%	574

Cost Factors

	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.884	1.335	1.160	1.126	1.231	1.298	573.5	3.32 E+17
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.268	1.027	1.291	1.023	0.999	0.988	1.334	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.721							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.987			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.334	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	2.265							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,566							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.023							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,832							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$6,785,528							
Actual Program Cost	\$5,086,374							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,699,154							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$6,785,528							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	33.4%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

TEXICO

User Input Cost Factors

Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
50.5%	2.8%	16.0%	21.6%	24.0%	31.1%	527

Cost Factors

[illegible]

State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.asp>



SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY

Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

ADVISORY

Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: D. Pauline Rindone *dpr*

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

The agenda for the May LESC meeting includes proposed funding formula calculations of school districts, including committee and group discussions. For your information, attached are the guidelines and questions that were sent to public school district superintendents to facilitate discussions with the committee regarding the impact of the proposed funding formula on school district operations.

State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.asp>



SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY

Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

ADVISORY

Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone *dpr*

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

You recently received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. You should have already received a copy of the LESC agenda for the May meeting that indicates your assigned group.

At the May LESC meeting, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operation to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department, have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information.

Programs and Services:

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost?
2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district?
 - a) Educational Programs:
 - b) Student Services:
3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?
4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding?
5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?
 - bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
 - health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
 - career-technical education;
 - visual and performing arts and music;
 - gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
 - special education; and
 - distance education.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers					
Principals					
Counselors					
Nurses					
Physical Education Teachers					
Art and Music Teachers					
Social Workers					
Librarians					
Advanced Placement Teachers					
Gifted Education					
Intervention Specialists					
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
 - The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
7. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

Special Education:

8. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? **(Do not include gifted students.)**

Number: _____ Percentage: _____%

9. How will the proposed funding formula's utilization of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Gifted Education:

10. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent?

Number: _____

Percentage: _____%

11. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require districts to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your district specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

Revenue Sources for Implementation:

12. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your district support?

Potential Problems:

13. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

14. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

15. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

xc: Legislative Education Study Committee

ISQ-A – Teachers, Including Librarians

Level I											
Years Within Level		0 – 1		2 – 3		4 – 5			Total		
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor			
Bachelor's		0.64	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.71	0.00				0.00
Master's		0.68	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.76	0.00				0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.71	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.79	0.00				0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				0.00
Level II											
Years Within Level		4 – 6		7 – 8		9 – 15			Total		
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor			
Bachelor's		0.76	0.00	0.82	0.00	0.93	0.00				0.00
Master's		0.81	0.00	0.88	0.00	1.00	0.00				0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.85	0.00	0.92	0.00	1.05	0.00				0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				0.00
Level III											
Years Within Level		7 – 8		9 – 15			Total				
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE					
Bachelor's		0.90	0.00	1.02	0.00	1.17	0.00				0.00
Master's		0.96	0.00	1.09	0.00	1.25	0.00				0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		1.01	0.00	1.14	0.00	1.31	0.00				0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				0.00
								Matrix Totals			
								0.00 0.00 0.00			

ISQ-B – Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience		0 – 2			3 – 5			6 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15			Total FTE	Total Adjusted FTE
		FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE		
Academic Classification																		
Bachelor's or Less			0.65	0.00		0.78	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.91	0.00		0.91	0.00	0.00	
Bachelor's + 15			0.70	0.00		0.83	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.96	0.00		1.00	0.00	0.00	
Master's/Bachelor's + 45			0.74	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.91	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.04	0.00	0.00	
Master's + 15			0.78	0.00		0.91	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.13	0.00		1.17	0.00	0.00	
Master's + 45/Post-Masters			0.87	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.13	0.00		1.22	0.00		1.30	0.00	0.00	
Total		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Matrix Totals																0.00	0.00	

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A + ISQ-B) 0.00 0.00
INDEX OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS #DIV/0!

ATTACHMENT